



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

is forestalled by the author's disavowal (p. 38) of any pretensions to observe that principle. Still such a disclaimer should not shield from criticism the writer who would give to Sinims as a poet nine pages, to Munford five pages, or to O'Hara four pages, while Pike and P. P. Cooke are dismissed with two pages each. And in the case of Poe—who receives but three pages—while one may excuse meagreness of critical and biographical detail, he cannot but feel that a biography of the most important and more recent references should have been given.

Certain errors of judgment or of statement are also to be noted. Captain Smith's poem (p. 21) should not be classed with the poetry of the South, inasmuch as Smith left Virginia in 1609, never to return again, while his poem is usually dated about 1630. And a slight modification should be made in the statement on page 94, to the effect that Cooke's *Froissart Ballads* were "based on the stories of the old French chronicler;" most of the ballads were indeed based on Froissart, but some of them—notably *The Master of Ballantrae* and *Geoffrey Tetenore*, the first two—as Cooke tells us in a prefatory note, were inventions of his own in the style of those based on Froissart.

But perhaps the chief limitation of the study is to be found in the incompleteness of its bibliographical lists. These lists, though as a rule full, do not include a number of magazine articles embodying the results of more recent and original research. Among the most important of these are the late Professor Ross's valuable articles on Timrod (*Quarterly Review of the M. E. Church South*, xiii, 239-261, 1893), Pinkney (*Sewanee Review*, iv, 287-297, 1896), and Meek (*Sewanee Review*, iv, 410-427, 1896). Other additions to be made to the bibliographical data are as follows:—under Cook¹ (p. 29): Steiner, *Publications of the Md. Hist. Socy.*, No. 36, pp. 102, 1900 (a reprint of the *Sotweed Factor*, with other early Maryland poems); under Tucker (p. 35): *Magazine of American Hist.*, vii, 45-46, 1881, and *Southern Literary Messenger*, ii, 469 f., 739, 1836; under Dabney (p. 43): *So. Lit. Mess.*, ix, 329 f., 390,

¹ The author should not perhaps be held accountable for omitting reference to the works I cite under Cook and Pike, since they probably appeared after his work had gone to the printers.

408 f., 557 f., 1848; under Allston (p. 46): the standard life of Allston, by Flagg, Scribner's, 1892; under Key (p. 48): *Century*, xxvi, 358 f., 1894; under Pike¹ (p. 69): the collective edition of Pike's poems, edited and published by Allsopp, Little Rock, Ark., 1900; under Wilde (p. 83): C. C. Jones, Jr., *Life, Literary Labors, and Neglected Grave of Wilde*, (no date), and certain articles on the authorship of Wilde's famous song, in *So. Lit. Mess.*, i, 252, 452, 1835, xxiii, 249, 1856; under Cooke (p. 95): *So. Lit. Mess.*, xxvi, 419-432, 1858, xvi, 125, 1850, xvii, 669 f., 701, 1851; and under Timrod (p. 129): Austin, *International Review*, ix, 310-319, 1880.

But to recognize in these omissions the chief limitation of the book constitutes, in reality, an admission that it has few or no serious limitations. Indeed, considering the difficulties under which Professor Bradshaw labored, he has done his work well. He need have little fear that his book, bringing together, as it does, in convenient form, a mass of information heretofore to be had only after much plodding—and to many largely inaccessible—will not prove both useful and interesting to the sympathetic student of the history of our literature.

KILLIS CAMPBELL.

University of Texas.

SCHILLER'S WALLENSTEIN.

Schiller's Wallenstein. Edited with introduction, notes, and map, by MAX WINKLER, Ph.D. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1901. 8vo, lxxvi+446 pp.

THIS welcome addition to the well-known Macmillan series presents itself as an attractive volume of suprisingly small compass if we consider the fullness of introductory matter and notes, and the unusual length of the text. The evident desire to reduce the bulk of the book has led to the adoption of type that is rather too small to be desirable in textbooks. It must be admitted, however, that the press work is of such excellency as to make the page, despite the small and crowded type, appear lucid and attractive.

Prof. Winkler's edition is evidently the result of conscientious scholarly labor, and al-

though Dr. Breul's exhaustive treatment of the drama must have materially lightened the work of the later editor, his work bears in every detail the impress of independent investigation, and plainly rests on wide reading in the historical literature on the subject.

The linguistic and historical interpretation of *Wallenstein*, though it calls for an extensive commentary, offers but few real difficulties and leaves but little room for differences of opinion. But some of the broader literary aspects of the drama continue to be veritable bones of contention among the most competent critics and commentators. On such questions, it is, therefore, permissible to differ considerably from the position taken by the editor without, thereby, in the least impugning the carefulness of his work or the soundness of his judgment. The present writer's views on most of these mooted topics are unfortunately not in accord with those held by Prof. Winkler, but no attempt shall be made to enter into their discussion, except in so far as the editor's general view on these matters has induced him to put on a few isolated passages a construction that does not seem warranted by the facts in the case.

Prof. Winkler's thoughtful *Introduction* is well written, and, despite its length, by no means prolix. It observes a fair balance between solid information and critical and literary suggestions, and seems slightly wanting only in warmth and personality of tone and treatment, and that, perhaps, purposely. For advanced college students it can hardly be said to contain much that is not desirable or, at any rate, useful. In fact, we regret the absence of a brief chapter on the general position of the drama in German literature.

Only the long first chapter on the historical *Wallenstein* seems to furnish considerably more information than is needed by the student of the *drama*, for the critical results of modern historical investigation cannot throw any light on the drama as such. More important, from a literary point of view, is a clear conception of *Wallenstein* as Schiller found him in his sources, which are far less accessible than the modern historical treatises. If, therefore, a wish might be expressed in regard to this chapter, which in itself is well done

and full of interest, we should prefer a briefer treatment of the *Wallenstein* of modern historical research, complemented by a fuller comparative treatment of the *Wallenstein* of Schiller's sources and of his *Geschichte des dreissigjährigen Kriegs..*

The second chapter of the introduction carefully traces the genesis of the drama at the hand of numerous illustrative references to Schiller's important correspondence on this subject, especially with Goethe and Körner. Some of these quotations incidentally open up the question of the place of fate in the economy of the play, a question which later is more fully discussed in the chapter dealing with the character of the *Wallenstein* of the drama. On one of these quotations I beg to offer a few remarks.

The word *Schicksal* in the passage from the letter of November 28, 1796 (p. xlv), as well as *Gestirne* in the famous lines 109-110 of the prologue, the editor interprets as "his fate in general, which is a necessary expression of his character." In both instances such an interpretation seems to do violence to the natural meaning of language and the logical cogency of thought. In the letter to Goethe, Schiller plainly has in mind the irreconcilable contrast between the historical facts of the *Wallenstein* story as he found it in his authorities, and his own convictions of what constitutes *Vergnügen am Tragischen*, as he had outlined them in 1792 in *Über die tragische Kunst*. These convictions can be plainly outlined by quoting a few passages from this important essay, to which, as to some others of the *Ästhetische Schriften*, Prof. Winkler makes rather too brief reference (p. xxxix).

"Diejenige Kunst, . . . , welche sich das *Vergnügen des Mitleids* ins besondere zum Zweck setzt, heisst *die tragische Kunst*."¹—"Die tragische Kunst wird also die Natur in denjenigen Handlungen nachahmen, welche den mitleidigen Affekt *vorzüglich* zu erwecken vermögen."²—"Wenn die *Unlust über die Ursache eines Unglücks zu stark* wird, so *schwächt* sie unser *Mitleid* mit demjenigen, der es erleidet."³—"So schwächt es jederzeit unseren Anteil, wenn sich der Unglückliche, den wir *bemitleiden* sollen, aus *eigner unverzeihlicher Schuld* in sein Verderben gestürzt hat."⁴—"Es wird jederzeit der höchsten Vollkommenheit

¹ These italics are Schiller's, the others are my own.

seines Werks Abbruch thun wenn der tragische Dichter nicht ohne einen Bösewicht auskommen kann, und wenn er gezwungen ist, *die Grösze des Leidens von der Grösze der Bosheit herzuleiten*.—"Zu einem weit höheren Grad steigt das Mitleid, wenn sowohl derjenige, welcher leidet, als derjenige, welcher Leiden verursacht, Gegenstände desselben werden. Dies kann nur dann geschehen, wenn der letztere weder unsern Hass noch unsre Verachtung erregt, sondern *wider seine Neigung* dahin gebracht wird, Urheber des Unglücks zu werden."

Now it is true that in 1792 the youthful poet of freedom was still so vigorously alive in Schiller as to dictate to him the sentence: "eine blinde Unterwürfigkeit unter das Schicksal (ist) immer demütigend und kränkend für freie sich selbst bestimmende Wesen" (ed. Goedeke, vol. 10, p. 26). That, however, even at that time Schiller had a high opinion of what he considered to be the æsthetic advantages of fate in tragedy is plainly shown by the statements leading up to the opinion just quoted, especially by the very suggestive paragraph ("Aber auf der höchsten und letzten Stufe" etc.), which immediately follows.

As a matter of fact an uninterrupted line of development can be traced from 1792 to 1803, and there can be no doubt that even in 1792 the ground of Schiller's artistic consciousness was well prepared for the later reception (in 1795 and following years) of seeds that were soon to bear fruit in some of the products of the *Balladenjahr*, in *Wallenstein*, and in the *Jungfrau*, and which reached their fullest development in *Die Braut von Messina* of 1803.

In the light of these facts, no doubt seems permissible concerning the meaning of the passage in the letter of Nov. 28, 1796. Besides, Prof. Winkler stops his quotation from this letter rather too soon, for the omitted last sentence is, perhaps, even more to the point than what precedes:

"Mich tröstet hier aber einigermaßen das Beispiel des Macbeth, wo das *Schicksal* ebenfalls weit weniger Schuld hat als der *Mensch*, dass er zu Grunde geht."²

If, in this context, *Schicksal* does not mean something for which man is *not* responsible, something, therefore, that cannot be "a necessary expression of his character," then the passage is devoid of all meaning.

² The italics are mine.

Quite the same is true of lines 109-110 of the prologue. The art of the poet, in order to bring the hero closer to our hearts (that is, for the sake of better securing the effect of tragic pity), frees him from part of his responsibility and *wälzt die grössze Hälfte seiner Schuld den unglückseligen Gestirnen zu*. Hence the latter phrase cannot refer to a necessary result of the hero's character. For if the larger part of his guilt were made to depend upon his character, what would become of the contrast in which it is meant to stand to the remaining part, the responsibility for which certainly is to rest on the hero?

Thus we are forced to admit that in these two, and in other similar passages, Schiller is plainly thinking of some agency not within that sphere of human action for which we hold the doer personally accountable. On the other hand, this is not the place for determining—if it really can be definitely determined—whether he has in mind the blind chance of outward circumstances over which we have no control, or the actual 'fate' of either the ancients or moderns,³ or Goethe's conception of *das Dämonische* in man (to which several passages in *Wallenstein* seem to point), or, finally, a world-soul, in contemplation of which

"Unzufriedenheit mit dem Schicksal hinwegfällt, und sich in die Ahndung oder lieber in ein deutliches Bewusstsein einer teleologischen Verknüpfung der Dinge, einer erhabenen Ordnung, eines gütigen Willens verliert." (*Ueber die tragische Kunst, Werke*, ed. Goedeke, vol. 10, p. 27.)

It would lead too far if I were to continue this line of thought more in detail, and I confine myself to two general inferences:

1. The attitude which one assumes with regard to what was Schiller's theory and purpose in this matter, extends its radiating influence in all directions and largely determines one's relation to almost all the other mooted phases of the drama: the characters of *Wallenstein* and *Octavio* (from Prof. Winkler's standpoint the former losing in sympathy, the latter gaining, while from the opposite point of view the reverse is the case), the significance of the astrological motif, the question of the genuineness of the *Buttlerbrief*, the *Wallenstein*-

³ Comp. Flath, *Die Schicksalsidee in der deutschen Tragödie*, p. 18.

Octavio dream,⁴ and the economic value of the Max-Thekla action. The latter Prof. Winkler judges almost solely from the ethical viewpoint, without calling equal attention to the purely artistic purpose (the only one stressed by Schiller, I believe) of furnishing relief scenes and of "rounding out a certain circle of human experience." As soon, however, as one judges the introduction of Max and Thekla from the ethical point of view, one's estimate necessarily becomes the direct result of one's general attitude on the above-discussed question of fate. Prof. Winkler assigns to these scenes above all the office of "accentuating the guilt of the hero," although admitting that they also serve to elevate his personality. From my standpoint the former cannot possibly be the case and, aside from their purely artistic functions, they can only serve to render the hero more sympathetic to us.

2. It is a point which, I believe, needs no special emphasis that in consequence of the view upheld in the above remarks one need not consider Schiller's *Wallenstein* as a tragedy of fate. At any rate, this is not done by Hettner,⁵ who, to my mind, has said some of the best and truest things about the drama, which he admires no less than I do. On the other hand, it is by no means impossible that one should hold the view represented by Prof. Winkler and many of the most prominent German commentators—that is, that there are no fatalistic traits in the drama as it stands—and yet admit the unmistakable plainness of what Schiller means when he discusses with Goethe *das Schicksal* with reference to *Wallenstein*. Such an attitude, while not my own, is by no means inconsistent, and would simply mean that a true poet's instinctive practice carried the day over philosophical theorizing, that the historical basis and older conception of a dramatic fable proved stronger than all later attempts to infuse into it elements originally

foreign to it, that in the Schiller of 1797 and 1798 there was enough left of the youthful "poet of freedom" to serve as an effective antidote against all æsthetic preferences for fatalistic theories.

As I have indicated, this is not my personal view; from my standpoint, I feel forced to admit that elements of a romantic fatalism have found their way into the grandest drama of German literature, although certainly not to the extent that Schiller seemed to think when he wrote of *die grössere Hälfte*.

The *text* of Prof. Winkler's edition is an excellent specimen of the most painstaking work, almost wholly free—as is indeed the entire book—from typographical errors and the many small inaccuracies that so often beset first editions. We have noticed only the following: p. lii, l. 9 from below; p. 317, l. 23; p. 331, l. 6; p. 335, l. 8; p. 390, l. 10 from below.

The *notes* occupy over one hundred and ten closely printed pages and are full and elaborate; but only in very few instances (for example, *Lager*, l. 48, l. 126) do they furnish information that is of no practical value for even the fullest appreciation of the text. A few notes (for example, Prol., l. 3; *Lager*, ll. 7 and 14) seem too elementary for students reading *Wallenstein*. On the other hand, there are a few cases where a note is called for: *daurend* for *dauernd* (Prol., l. 39); *sahe* (Picc., l. 2269); *kläresten* (Picc., l. 2342); *Geschichten* (Tod, l. 326). On the whole, however, the annotation is both scholarly and practical, constantly having in view the actual needs of college students as well as of such teachers as have no access to additional reference literature. There are numerous references to the works of Schiller, Goethe, and others, but since the passages referred to are generally not quoted, they will in practice, if not by necessity, remain inaccessible to most students. It would seem, indeed, that in a text for students, if references are considered of real value, they should be given in full, unless they be much too long.

Lack of space renders it impossible, at present, to take up in detail a number of individual passages that invite discussion. This will be done, however, in one of the next issues.

⁴ Prof. Winkler seems to treat this point too lightly when, on p. lxvi, he states that "it is not at all remarkable that two generals . . . should dream of the impending conflict." Surely, it is not, but equally surely is there a great deal more involved than just this bare fact.

⁵ Not only in his *Literaturgeschichte d. 18. Jh.*, but also in *Die romantische Schule in ihrem inneren Zusammenhang mit Goethe und Schiller*, p. 101 ff.

In conclusion we consider it our duty again to express to the editor our full appreciation of the excellency of his work and to thank him, even though on many of the important questions we belong to "the other side," for having furnished us a thoroughly good working edition of *Wallenstein*.

A. R. HOHLFELD.

Vanderbilt University.

DANISH-NORWEDIAN-ENGLISH DICTIONARY.

Dansk-Norsk-Engelsk Ordbog of A. LARSEN. Tredie Udgave. Gennemset of Johannes Magnussen. København, Gyldendal, 1897. 687 pp.

THE last edition of Larsen's *Ordbog*, revised by Johannes Magnussen, does not differ materially from the third edition of 1888, except in the normalization of the spelling. In the earlier editions the traditional spelling had been adhered to, but Magnussen has adopted the orthographic standards recommended by the ministry of culture. In the edition of 1888 Larsen embodied about 50,000 technical terms and Danish and Norwegian words that had not previously appeared in any Danish-Norwegian dictionary. Highly valuable as the work was, it left much to be hoped for in that a mass of Norwegian words that are in common use and are found in the works of Ibsen, Björnson, and Kielland had been omitted. The failure to include specifically Norwegian words occurring in works as widely read as Ibsen's *Brand* and *Peer Gynt*, Björnson's *Synnöve Solbakken*, Arne and En *Glad Gut*, and Kielland's *Skipper Worse* was a fault that should have been remedied in the revised edition; but while some new material has been added it is to be regretted that so many omissions still occur. We note here the following, from the three works of Björnson mentioned above: *Aan*, as in *Hö-aannen*, the hay-making season; *dætte*, to fail; *ende*, as in *ende op*, straight up; *fyge op*, to flare up; *Fark*, a ne'er do well; *Gnæg*; *hövelig*, suitable; *koune*, to smother; *kringmæll*, said of one who speaks fast; *leike*, to play, Danish *lege*; *Leite*, time; *Læm*, an upper room; *mörklet*, Dan. *mörkladen*; *Nab*, a peg; *Regle*, a story;

Rid, a while; *rape*, to crumble, fall; *skamfare*, to damage; *Spurlag*, written *Sportlag* by Jonas Sie, rumor, report; from Ibsen's *Brand* and *Peer Gynt*; *Bos*, chaff; *Brot*; *Bö*, *dag-blak*, *Frænke*, *forskingre*, *klarne*, *kende*, in the sense to grope about; *med*, also; *nem*; *nöre*, to kindle; *Nemme*, cleverness, talent; *plent*, just, entirely; *Sprike*, crack; *stödt*, always; *Spjeld* and *Yr*, and the word *löien* from *Skipper Worse*. Under *lei* should also have been given the definition 'troublesome,' which is a very common meaning of the word. The Norwegian *kvas* is given together with the Danish *hvas*, but *Gagn* and the derivatives *Ugagn* and *tilgagns* (Danish *Gavn*, *Ugavn*, *tilgavns*) are omitted; so also *gnage*, Danish *gnave*. The dialect word *trive* is given but the words *Bil*, a while, *bjart*, *kverve*, *fram*, *oppi*, *overlag*, very, *sövine*, and *tröisom*, merry, interesting, all of which are found in Ibsen or Björnson are omitted. Under *god* and *ilde* the Norwegian idioms *god til*, able to, and *at blive ilde ved*, to become ill at ease, embarrassed, should have been included. *Paa Lag*, about, as in *Hvormeget paa Lag*, and *paa Stel*, beside one's self, which occur in Björnson, should have been given. Larsen's *Ordbog* is too well known to need any special recommendation. It is an excellent work in spite of the omissions noted, though it is hoped that the next edition will include all words found in the works of the chief Norwegian and Danish writers of the nineteenth century.

GEORGE T. FLOM.

University of Iowa.

FRENCH LITERATURE.

Études sur la littérature française. Par RENÉ DOUMIC. Quatrième Série. Librairie Académique. Perrin et Cie., 1901.

M. BRUNETIÈRE is certainly one of the strongest minds in contemporary France. The large number of his enemies in the literary world and elsewhere would alone suffice to prove it. His opinions, thanks especially to the *Revue des deux Mondes*, have now been the property of the French people for a good many years. It was impossible that the persistent repetition of the same ideas, presented, as they were by